

**SCOTTSDALE CITY COUNCIL
SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGIONAL AVIATION ISSUES
AND SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING**

NOVEMBER 19, 2003

MINUTES

PRESENT: **City Council Subcommittee:**
 Councilman Wayne Ecton Councilman Bob Littlefield

Airport Advisory Commission:
 Donald Maxwell, Chairman Leonard Tinnan, Vice Chairman
 Tom Guilfooy Mike Osborne
 Bill Mack Fred Madanick
 Phil Vickers

STAFF: Scott Gray, Aviation Director Chris Read, Asst. Aviation Director
 Gary Mascaro, Asst. Aviation Director Matt Johnson, Airport Specialist
 Jennifer Lewis, Airport Planner

OTHER(S): Kevin Shirer, HDR Corp. Scott Calev, Resident

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 5:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no cards submitted at this point for public comment.

MINUTES

1. Approval of September 17, 2003 Subcommittee Meeting Minutes.

Councilman Ecton made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 17, 2003 meeting. Councilman Littlefield seconded the motion and it passed by a vote of 2-0.

GENERAL BUSINESS

2. Staff presentation on the results of the Aircraft Operating and Monitoring System (AOMS) RFP.

Mr. Gary Mascaro advised the joint meeting that he would be presenting the history and background of the aircraft monitoring system, otherwise known as the flight tracking system, and then turn the presentation over to Ms. Lewis who will provide the results of the RFP and some possible options in funding, and then would be seeking further direction.

Mr. Mascaro added that the flight tracking system is a tool to assist them in their response to citizen inquiries and in their pilot/community outreach efforts. He added that flight tracking systems are a resource used by general aviation, as well as many commercial airports throughout the country to provide an increased level of information.

Mr. Mascaro advised that there was one respondent to the RFP which went out in August 2003, and that was from the Rannoch Corporation, which was the company that provided the Airscene 3D presentation earlier this year which showed examples of the flight tracking system.

Ms. Jennifer Lewis advised that Airscene provides several components that can be mixed and matched to be combined into one system. Ms. Lewis provided details on each of the various components, and advised there are several different ways flight track information can be displayed. Ms. Lewis stated the flight track information collected by Airscene is not reliant on FAA data or radar signals; it is a standalone system with independent centers that provide coverage down to the ground. The system user can filter the information to determine what information is available internally or externally.

Ms. Lewis then provided some detail on Airscene's noise complaint entry system. She stated it is a basic system and fairly easy to understand. The difference between what is collected now versus what Airscene offers is the ability for automatic geo-coding, which allows an address to be mapped on a GIS system. It also allows it to be correlated with data collected from other Airscene system components. Ms. Lewis added there is a website component which allows someone to register their own complaint on the system or research data, however, staff would be able to determine what data they can access. Ms. Lewis added this would also be a feature for pilots, or for potential home buyers to map an address and research historical flight activity in a particular area.

Councilman Ecton questioned if they would have to train citizens who are interested in using the system. Mr. Gray responded that staff would provide instruction how to utilize the system, should one be purchased. He added it is fairly easy to use from the website.

Councilman Littlefield inquired if the system is not reading the FAA radar what is it reading. Mr. Gray responded the system works by using independent sensors that triangulate the location of the aircraft.

Ms. Lewis continued and stated that the noise monitors that are part of the Airscene system could be permanent or portable. However, the permanent monitors require construction and access to utilities. The portable system would be moveable and operate on batteries. Ms. Lewis added the audio portion of the system does record the communications between the pilot and the air traffic controllers and this would be the only way for staff to identify an aircraft operator under visual flight rules.

Ms. Lewis advised some other supplemental components would include weather which allows the weather data to be recorded, and 3D airspace analysis.

Ms. Lewis stated the RFP review committee evaluated the full proposal submitted by Rannoch and they agreed on a basic system, which includes flight tracking, noise complaint entry, website access, and audio recording and playback, which they felt would meet the community's needs.

Councilman Ecton asked if options can be added afterwards. Ms. Lewis responded yes. Mr. Mascaro interjected that they have the ability to decide what options they want depending on the amount they want to spend and whether they would rather phase in other options.

Mr. Mascaro stated the estimated cost of the package suggested by the review committee is \$350,000. He added they currently have budgeted \$60,000 in the Aviation Enterprise Fund for a flight tracking system, and they would have to request capital contingency funding for the difference. Mr. Mascaro stated the full package, which includes noise monitoring, weather tracking, and 3D Airscene increases the cost significantly, mainly due to the noise monitoring option. He added they can find other ways to fund the system, for example reprioritizing some of the aviation projects or reallocating some of the funds. In addition, the quoted costs do not include annual maintenance and utility charges. Mr. Mascaro added that all these details would be worked out if they move forward with the system.

Councilman Ecton stated his question was if they buy the suggested package could they at a later date add the other features. Councilman Ecton said the noise monitoring feature is intriguing, but how good is it and is it valid enough to make an investment in it. Mr. Gray responded that the noise monitoring system

would be similar to any noise monitoring system like Sky Harbor or any of the other airports have. The difference would be whether you choose permanent or portable monitors. Mr. Gray added that typically it is better to pinpoint a location and leave the equipment there so you obtain historical data. The system obtains valid data, the issue is citizens' interpretation of what the data is. Mr. Gray added the advantage of having a noise monitoring system with a flight tracking system is that you can correlate the two pieces of information.

Chairman Maxwell asked if the system is intended to track the complaints coming from other communities such as Cave Creek and Carefree. Mr. Mascaro responded the intent is to set it up for the City of Scottsdale and the Scottsdale Airport area.

Chairman Maxwell asked if the City spends this kind of money for a system, what do they then do with a violation and can the City enforce the violation. Mr. Gray responded that at this time there is no criteria that the City has established that would result in a City violation, other than the existing code, such as low-flying aircraft, because it is not FAA data they could utilize the information and provide the information to the Flight Standards District Office and it would identify the particular aircraft and altitude. Therefore, the actual enforcement mechanism is still the FAA. Mr. Gray added that if the City were to adopt a policy at a later date after going through the appropriate study, such as a Part 161, then it could be enforced.

Chairman Maxwell asked what information a person could get from the system on their home computer. Mr. Gray responded that would be variable and whatever staff wanted it to be. Once a system is chosen the City would issue a policy as to what information would be made available on the website.

Councilman Ecton inquired if those in Cave Creek or Carefree wanted information from our system would we ask them to pay for that particular amenity. Mr. Gray responded that the noise monitors at specific locations are typically are within a mile or so of the airport. Mr. Gray said the six sensors would cover the entire City of Scottsdale. Mr. Gray added if you put a noise monitor somewhere else, such as Carefree or Fountain Hills, generally speaking it is not going to provide the normal noise monitoring data for an airport.

Chairman Maxwell asked if this system is a duplication of the monitors used in the Part 150 Study. Mr. Gray responded no that the Part 150 Study is determining noise levels, noise abatement procedures and land use recommendations – it is not flight tracking.

Councilman Exton inquired if they knew where they plan on putting the noise monitors. Mr. Gray responded they don't know. Chairman Maxwell inquired what they do with them. Mr. Gray responded that if the City Council were to choose to acquire a system, staff would have to look into various City policies if that were the Council's desire, and look at single event levels, but in order to do an enforcement of any sort, you would have to a Part 161 Study. Some communities, before they had to do Part 161 Studies, actually set single event level restrictions at their airports. They used their noise monitoring systems to find out if someone exceeded that. The City of Scottsdale is not prevented from setting its own single event levels, they just cannot enforce it with a penalty.

Vice Chairman Tinnan asked if there was any merit in waiting till the Part 150 Study is complete before they make a decision in proceeding with this. Mr. Gray responded the consideration is the suggested package, which is for flight tracking only. He stated he believes there is a benefit in waiting for the Part 150 to be completed to determine whether or not noise monitors should be installed. There is also the possibility that noise monitoring may be recommended in a Part 150 Study, and if so, it will become grant eligible, whereas, right now they would have to spend their own money. Mr. Gray advised it isn't likely that a flight tracking system would be eligible for funding through the Part 150 process.

Vice Chairman Tinnan stated he is not comfortable that there was only one response to the RFP and why there wasn't a more competition there. He asked what kind of warranty or performance assurance would they provide to the City. Mr. Gray responded that the system the City was primarily interested in was one that was not reliant on radar and FAA data. The problem the City of Scottsdale has at this point is there is no radar coverage to the ground that is certified for use. He added there will be a new radar installed in

the north valley somewhere between 2005-2007. And if it were bid out again as just a flight tracking system with no limitations you would have several vendors bid. Mr. Gray added this is the only vendor that provides something that will utilize their own standalone system and does not use radar data. Therefore, because the language in the RFP stated not to use radar data, there aren't as many vendors (and it appears there is only one) available.

Vice Chairman Tinnan questioned performance assurance when spending that kind of money. Ms. Lewis responded she spoke to several of the users at other airports – some general aviation, some commercial service airports that have the Rannoch system and they all stated that their system and that the company's response is highly recommendable.

Vice Chairman Tinnan asked what benefit have those existing users realized from the system. Do they just have more information, or have they had some usefulness that provides for happier citizens. Ms. Lewis responded that each of the users she spoke with had a primary purpose for their system that was different from other airports. One airport relied upon it for billing information, one for noise information and not all the airports have all the components, only pieces of the package that is presented today. None of the airports use it for enforcement purposes.

Several members of the Commission asked Ms. Lewis how much she would use the system if it were in place. Ms. Lewis responded she would use it a lot based on conversations she has had with pilots, potential home buyers, and noise complainers which would have meant spending three quarters of her day on this system. Ms. Lewis stated in her experience at other airports, Long Beach and San Francisco, those airports relied on this type of information to respond to people wanting to know, who was that airplane, how low was that airplane and the information isn't available any other way. You cannot go to a pilot and ask how high were you over highway such and such, as they are not going to know, and may come ask you how high they actually were and how well did they perform. They would have a resource to go back and check it out.

Mr. Gray added another issue is workload and has to do with the recent web access and they are concerned if they have all the information and the citizens don't have access to it without calling us, we will find ourselves needing numerous people to print reports and mail them out or to return citizen phone calls. He added that many users of this system have found that many citizens go to the website and look for answers to their own questions, and that is their goal.

Chairman Maxwell asked Ms. Lewis what sub division are people interested in that they ask for information, and how many noise complaints have she notified pilots of since she's been here.

Ms. Lewis responded the subdivision at 50th and Cholla, and near 101 and Shea. Commissioner Mack stated that was probably near Scottsdale Ranch. Mr. Gray stated they don't send a letter to everyone they get a noise complaint from, however, with system it is possible it may change.

Mr. Gray reiterated that one system package – the suggested package – does not include the noise monitoring feature. It will provide where it was, possibly what it was, and how high it was. The other system, if you add noise monitoring to that package, you could correlate the information to that particular aircraft.

Commissioner Guilfooy stated the suggested package looks to him like FAA radar in Scottsdale and there is nothing in there except for a realtime component that is different from the BRITE screen in the tower, an airfiltered screen at the TRACON or anything else. He added the information that we are potentially spending \$350,000 for already exists and it just seems like the impediment is getting some sort of agreement with the FAA to have realtime or near realtime data.

Mr. Gray stated the original \$60,000 budget was to purchase the system or tie into the system at Sky Harbor. The problem with that at this point, is the radar is over at Sky Harbor and does not provide us with details below 1500-1600 ft. AGL. He added that it does not provide any adequate data. If new radar were installed several years from now it very well could provide that data to the ground using FAA data.

However, the FAA data, under the current agreement similar to what Sky Harbor has, is delayed three days and it filters some aircraft activity out. The radar at Williams Gateway is not certified and we do not get that data. It is there and it's used for the BRITE scope in the tower but they cannot use it for separation, and it cannot be used in a flight tracking system.

Councilman Ecton asked if they give us tracks from that system. Mr. Gray responded they did ask for information from the Williams Gateway radar during the Part 150 during the time they monitored, so they did get it. Mr. Gray added that that system does not "talk" to the Phoenix system and then it is all combined.

Councilman Littlefield asked if we went to the FAA and we want the tracks for these days, from Williams Gateway radar, will they give it to us. Mr. Gray responded, yes, as they did for their 150. Councilman Littlefield asked what the cost is for the information. Ms. Lewis responded the charge is \$150 per hour for staff time. Councilman asked what they got and what they paid for the last data they requested. Ms. Lewis responded they asked for a week's worth of data, it took them a day and a half to put it together, and it was given to them with the warning that additional requests will be charged \$150 an hour to compile the data. Therefore \$1800 for a week's data. Mr. Mascaro interjected that they were advised that if they continue to ask for data on a routine basis, they would need to sign a long term letter of agreement at the federal level and pay the associated maintenance costs.

Mr. Gray stated the issue right now is the radar data they have available is not certified. When the new radar is installed at Central and Union Hills the \$60,000 that had been budgeted could be used to tap into the Phoenix system that would have actual certified radar data. Commissioner Guilfoxy inquired what the impact of uncertified data was on something that is unenforceable. Mr. Gray responded uncertified radar only means they cannot use it for radar separation. Mr. Gray added they have asked just to have a feed from the tower to use the BRITE scope and they were denied that activity. Mr. Gray added that the only enforcement efforts that could be done would be to any of the existing noise abatement procedures. They could establish other procedures, but there could not be a penalty.

Commissioner Madanick inquired what they do about the operator who left Scottsdale Airport at twenty minutes to five on Monday morning and woke up an entire neighborhood. Mr. Gray responded they send those particular individuals a letter. Commissioner Madanick asked what good does that do. Mr. Gray responded that in some cases the pilots respond that they were unaware of the voluntary curfew program. They have since had conversations with the FBO's to ensure they are telling pilots that a voluntary curfew is in place. Some pilots, however, operate during those hours depending on what the activity is, typically most of those are emergency medical activities and are required to take off when necessary.

Commissioner Vickers inquired what type of written warranty will Rannoch furnish that the system will operate as represented. He also inquired what are the estimated annual maintenance costs and the increased operating costs that staff may incur. Mr. Mascaro responded they have not yet gone into detail regarding that information, however, they do have copies of examples of maintenance agreements and operating agreements. They have not negotiated any contract or presented any of their questions as they are still in the preliminary stages. Mr. Mascaro advised they did not want to waste anyone's time or effort by having those discussions until they get direction. Commissioner Vickers inquired how they can consider a capital investment without knowing the long-term operating costs that would affect the annual operating budget on an annual basis. Mr. Mascaro responded that at this point they are just looking for direction whether to move forward with it to the City Council with all that additional information.

Councilman Ecton inquired what does it state in the sample agreements. Mr. Mascaro responded the annual maintenance costs are estimated between \$60,000-\$70,000 per year and that does not include the noise monitoring. Ms. Lewis added that the estimated utility charges are \$5,000 a year. Councilman Ecton stated they could add another employee for that amount each year, and Mr. Gray responded they may still have to do that anyway.

Commissioner Mack asked if the public can interact with the system on the internet, and if so what reaction can they have coming back to the City. Mr. Gray responded the public can interact with the system and the information provided to the public is generally the flight track of the aircraft and the altitude. Commissioner Mack was concerned that similar to when the noise complaint system was added to the website they were buried in noise complaints with every accessing the system. Mr. Gray stated they hope there will be enough information provided on the website that staff will not be overloaded with inquiries for information.

Commissioner Mack asked what the percentage of users might be from Scottsdale versus those in outlying areas. Mr. Gray responded that approximately 60 percent might be from Scottsdale. Mr. Gray added that anyone with a computer can see the information, however, the noise complaint system will be unchanged.

Commissioner Guilfooy asked if he could enter his address into the system and the system would give him information so he could view flight tracks over his house. Mr. Gray responded that could be done in either realtime, delayed or whatever timeframe the City would desire to program in. Typically, they would probably use a 5-15 minutes delay. Chairman Maxwell inquired if an aircraft can block their identity. Mr. Gray responded that the transponder in S-mode, which is most of the business jets, has a lot of information that would be provided to the system. However, it would be up to the City to determine what information it would provide to the citizens, for example providing the N number is irrelevant.

Councilman Ecton requested to review the slide concerning alternative data sources. He stated FAA TRACON data, the current data that does not go down to the ground in Scottsdale – what do we pay for that. Mr. Gray stated they will now charge us \$150. He then questioned how much the passive radar subscription costs. Mr. Mascaro responded that's one of those priority companies where a bid is put out and they filter it as well. He then asked about the Phoenix Sky Harbor Noise Management System – and could they connect into that and what would it cost. Mr. Gray responded that was the \$60,000 that they already have budgeted but it only uses the radar at Phoenix. Councilman asked when the new radar goes in up at Central and Union Hills TRACON will now have radar coverage down to the ground in Scottsdale and he would like to know if they wait for that what would that cost. Mr. Gray responded it would depend upon whether or not there are any additional needs Phoenix has to do to get the data to Scottsdale. Currently they are estimating to tap into their system would cost \$60,000, however, a couple of years from now it may cost more.

Vice Chairman Tinnan asked if they knew the percentage of operations of IFR vs. VFR, in other words, what part of the total population would they cover with the flight tracking system. Mr. Gray responded approximately 60 percent.

Councilman Ecton made a motion to not forward a flight tracking system to the full Council. Councilman Littlefield seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous 2-0.

Commissioner Osborne made a motion to forward to City Council. Commissioner Vickers seconded the motion. The motion failed by a vote of 5-2 (Commissioners Osborne and Vickers.)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Scott Calev commented on the VOR approach over his home. He requested that it be moved. Mr. Gray provided a brief explanation on the location and history. Dr. Calev expressed his appreciation for the explanation.

It was decided to cancel the December meeting. The next meeting will be January 21, 2004.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.